



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,165	06/12/2000	Mahadevan Iyer	39299/JEC/X2	5156

35114 7590 01/30/2004

ALCATEL INTERNETWORKING SYSTEM, INC.
ALCATEL-INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
3400 W. PLANO PARKWAY, MS LEGL2
PLANO, TX 75075

EXAMINER

CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2661

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/592,165

Applicant(s)

IYER ET AL.

Examiner

Salvatore Cangialosi

Art Unit

2661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7 . 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2661

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Moriconi et al in view of Agraharam et al and Falls et al.

Regarding claim 1, Moriconi et al (See Figs. 3-4, col. 4, lines 35-57) disclose method and apparatus for having a central policy database control several remote databases substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of a specific type of database structure and server use. Falls et al (See Col. 7, lines 25-35) show typical hierarchal object structure database and Agraharam et al (Col. 3, lines 50-60) show a server operated database. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Moriconi et al

Art Unit: 2661

because it is obvious to employ typical well known database structures because they are well known and conventional.

Regarding claim 2, the differences between the above and the claimed invention are the use of hierarchal object structure for every database claimed. It is further obvious that servers can be edge devices in a network since they route data between client and resource. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Moriconi et al because it is obvious to employ typical well known database structures because they are well known and conventional and this is no more than the replication of existing structure. Regarding claim 3, the differences between the above and the claimed invention is policy settings. Moriconi et al (See Figs. 3-4, col. 4, lines 35-57) disclose method and apparatus for having a central policy database control several remote databases substantially as claimed. Regarding the resource object policy limitations of claim 4, Moriconi et al (See Figs. 3-4, col. 2, lines 10-30) show network resource and policy objects. Regarding the LDAP limitations of claim 5, Agraharam et al (See Col. 4, lines 1-10) shows LDAP database structure in a server. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Moriconi et al because it is obvious to employ typical well known database structures because they are well known and conventional. Regarding the resource, host and network limitations of claim 6, 7, and 8

Art Unit: 2661

respectively, Moriconi et al (See Figs. 3-4, col. 2, lines 10-30) show typical network resources of which the claims are typical elements. Regarding the virtual private network policy object limitations of claims 9-12, Moriconi et al (See Figs. 3-4, col. 2, lines 10-30) show network policy objects as typically being virtual private networks. Regarding claim 13, Moriconi et al (See Figs. 3-4, col. 4, lines 35-57) disclose method and apparatus for having a central policy database control several remote databases substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of a specific type of database structure and server use. Falls et al (See Col. 7, lines 25-35) show typical hierarchal object structure database and Agraharam et al (Col. 3, lines 50-60) show a a sever operated database. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Moriconi et al because it is obvious to employ typical well known database structures because they are well known and conventional. Regarding claim 14, the differences between the above and the claimed invention are the use of hierarchal object structure for every database claimed. It is further obvious that servers can be edge devices in a network since they route data between client and resource. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Moriconi et al because it is obvious to employ typical well known database structures because they are well known and

Art Unit: 2661

conventional and this is no more than the replication of existing structure. Regarding claim 15, the differences between the above and the claimed invention is policy settings. Moriconi et al (See Figs. 3-4, col. 4, lines 35-57) disclose method and apparatus for having a central policy database control several remote databases substantially as claimed. Regarding the resource object policy limitations of claim 16, Moriconi et al (See Figs. 3-4, col. 2, lines 10-30) show network resource and policy objects. Regarding the LDAP limitations of claim 17, Agraharam et al (See Col. 4, lines 1-10) shows LDAP database structure in a server. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Moriconi et al because it is obvious to employ typical well known database structures because they are well known and conventional. Regarding the resource, host and network limitations of claim 18, 19, and 20 respectively, Moriconi et al (See Figs. 3-4, col. 2, lines 10-30) show typical network resources of which the claims are typical elements. Regarding the virtual private network policy object limitations of claims 21-24, Moriconi et al (See Figs. 3-4, col. 2, lines 10-30) show network policy objects as typically being virtual private networks.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number (703) 305-1837. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

Serial Number: 09/592,165

6

Art Unit: 2661

examiner's supervisor, Douglas Olms, can be reached at (703)
305-4703.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:


Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to (703)872-9306

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park
II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia, Sixth
Floor(Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of
this application or proceeding should be directed to the
Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) 306-0377.


SALVATORE CANGIALOSI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 222